

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the present case. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended herein. Claim 26 is cancelled herein. No new matter has been added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,358), hereafter referred to as Narayanaswamy in view of Kim (U.S. Patent No. 6,466,292), hereafter referred to as Kim. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Applicant has reviewed the cited references. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Narayanaswamy fails to teach or suggest a first display component having multi-sided functionality. Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component." Narayanaswamy fails to teach or suggest this limitation. In fact, Narayanaswamy teaches away from this limitation by teaching "In any case, the image signals are divided into subsets based on the proportions of each image displayed by the various display devices. For example, in the embodiment of FIG. 4, where the display devices display the top and bottom halves of each image, respectively, the image signals are divided into two subsets accordingly" (Column 4 lines 1-7).

Dividing the image signals into a plurality of subsets is very different from "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed. Narayanaswamy purports to teach using multiple displays to display an image that would not fit on a single display. Embodiments of the present invention transfer an image from a first viewing side of a display to a second viewing side of the display according to the position of the cover (display). This claim limitation provides easy access to information that is displayed on the cover of the device, even when the device cover is opened.

Kim fails to remedy the deficiencies of Narayanaswamy. Kim may purport to teach a display component with multiple viewing surfaces, however, the display component of Kim is very different from the claimed limitations of the present invention. Specifically, the display device of Kim comprises 2 displays, each of the different displays being a different size. Having two screens of a different size would hinder the performance of the present invention because an image on the larger screen could not be transferred to the smaller screen without modification (e.g., crop to fit on the smaller screen).

Furthermore, the display of Kim fails to teach or suggest "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed. In fact, the controller of Kim is configured to "activate the first region viewable on the inner surface of the folding cover in accordance with a signal from the switch, which is switched by the open and closed state of the folding cover." Activating a display side according to a signal of a switch is very different from "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed. For the previous rational, Claim 1 is patentably distinct over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim. As such, Claims 1-5 are in condition and the allowance of Claims 1-5 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy in view of Kim and further in view of Moscovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,006 B1), hereafter referred to as Moscovich. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

As stated above, Narayanaswamy alone, or taken in combination with Kim fails to teach or suggest "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display

component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed. Moscovich fails to remedy the deficiencies of Narayanaswamy and Kim.

Moscovich may purport to teach a computer display screen system, however, Moscovich fails to teach the claimed limitations of the present invention. Specifically, Moscovich fails to teach or suggest "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed. For the previous rational, Claim 6 is patentably distinct over Narayanaswamy, Kim and Moscovich. As such, Claim 6 is in condition for allowance and allowance of Claim 6 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim and Moscovich in yet further view of Albert (U.S. Patent No. 6,252,564 B1), hereafter referred to as Albert. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

As stated above, Narayanaswamy, Kim and Moscovich fail to teach or suggest "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed.

Applicant has reviewed the Albert reference and respectfully asserts that Albert, alone, or taken in combination with Narayanaswamy, Kim and still yet Moscovich fails to teach or suggest "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed. As such, Claims 7-11 are patently distinguishable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, and still yet Albert. As such, allowance of Claims 7-11 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 12-13 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, Albert and still yet, in view of Albert (U.S. Patent No. 6,392,786), hereafter referred to as Albert. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational. As stated above, Narayanaswamy, Kim and Moscovich fail to teach or suggest "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed. Applicant has reviewed the Albert reference and respectfully asserts that Albert, alone, or taken in combination with Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich and Albert fails to teach or suggest "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed.

As such, Claims 12-13 and 15-18 are patently distinguishable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, Albert and Albert. As such, allowance of Claims 12-13 and 15-18 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, Albert and Albert in still yet in view of Helsin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,326,613 B1), hereafter referred to as Helsin. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the rational presented for Claim 6. Applicant asserts that Helsin fails to teach or suggest "wherein when said front cover is moved from a closed position to an open position, an image on a first viewing side of said first display component is transferred to a second viewing side of said first display component," as claimed. Applicant asserts that Claim 14 is patentably distinguishable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Moscovich, Albert and Albert in still yet in view of Helsin. As such, allowance of Claim 14 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 19-20 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim in view of Yamamoto (U.S. Patent No. 6,297,945 B1), hereafter referred to as Yamamoto. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Narayanaswamy fails to teach a second display component having multi-sided functionality and upon flippable cover opening to open state, front display becomes deactivated, back display panel becomes activated and displays first images and first display component becomes activated for the display of second images.

Kim fails to remedy the deficiencies of Narayanaswamy. Kim may purport to teach a display component with multiple viewing surfaces, however, the display component of Kim is very different from the claimed limitations of the present invention. Specifically, the display device of Kim comprises 2 displays, each of the different displays being a different size. Having two screens of a different size would hinder the performance of the present invention because an image on the larger screen could not be transferred to the smaller screen without modification (e.g., crop to fit on the smaller screen). Kim fails to teach or suggest "upon said flippable cover opening to said open state, said front display panel becomes deactivated, said back display panel becomes activated and displays said first images and said first display component becomes activated for the display of second images," as claimed. Furthermore, Yamamoto fails to teach or suggest this limitation of the present invention. As such, Claims 19-20 and 25 are patentably distinguishable over Narayanaswamy and Kim. As such, allowance of Claims 19 and 20 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narayanaswamy, Kim, Yamamoto in view of Helsin. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the following rational. As stated above, Narayanaswamy, Kim and Yamamoto fail to teach or suggest "upon said flippable cover opening to said open state, said front display panel becomes deactivated, said back display panel becomes activated and displays said first images and said first display component becomes activated for the display of second images," as claimed. Helsin fails to remedy the deficiencies of Narayanaswamy, Kim and Yamamoto. As such, Claim 21 is patentably distinguishable over Narayanaswamy, Kim and Yamamoto in view of Helsin. As such, allowance of Claim 21 is earnestly solicited.

Claims 22-23 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Moscovich and Kim. Claim 26 has been cancelled herein and as such, the rejection is moot. The rejection of Claims 22-23 is respectfully traversed for the following rational.

Claims 22-23 teach "upon said second cover opening, said front display panel of said second cover becomes deactivated, said back display panel of said second cover becomes activated and displays said first images and said first display panel of said first cover becomes activated for the display of second images." For the rational presented above, Yamamoto, Moscovich and Kim fail

to teach or suggest transferring an image from a first viewing side of a display device to a second viewing side of the display device as claimed. As such, Claims 22 and 23 are patentably distinguishable over Yamamoto, Moscovich and Kim. As such, allowance of Claims 22 and 23 is earnestly solicited.

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moscovich, Kim and Yamamoto in view of Helsin. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the rational presented in support for Claim 22. Helsin fails to remedy the deficiencies of Moscovich, Kim and Yamamoto. As such, Claim 24 is patentably distinguishable over Moscovich, Kim, Yamamoto and Helsin. As such, allowance of Claim 24 is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the amendments and arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-25 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 8/6/2007



Anthony C. Murabito
Reg. No. 35,295

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060